Questions Answered During Webinar		
Question	Votes	Response
With the transitioning of SARN to CTA for Bus Chassis, is there guidance which the OEM of bus chassis can use to validate to customers/state agency of no inclusion of SARN on a complete Bus unit.	11	The *Guide to component type approvals* was updated for ROVER Release 7 and this information has been included.
When will functionality be added to allow for multiple vehicles on one NRI? (E.g.: Test and Evaluation vehicles)	10	The department is aiming to deliver the ability to include multiple vehicles on a single application in a future release, expected in the first quarter of 2023.
Some applications have exceeded 60 days. Are there internal flags in ROVER identifying applications approaching 60 days? Also, for complete transparency, could a clock be added to submissions to help Industry identify days elapsed?	10	The number of days remaining to decide an application is visible to assessors (noting it is 60 business days, not calendar days). The clock starts when an application is submitted and paid for. The list of outstanding applications is monitored on a daily basis. There are currently no plans to build a clock for external users.
When using a UN ECE Approval as evidence of compliance for lighting, component Part Nos considered unnecessary in a CI template as the Approval No already contains all required detail for audit/traceability. Agreed in principle by Dept in last webinar and to be reviewed. Any progress on this item?	10	This issue has been captured and added to the ROVER development/prioritisation backlog. This has not yet been scheduled for formal release.
Why are the compliance and enforcement team requesting further information on design change, production processes of ECE approvals when these should be accepted under the 1958 agreement?	9	This was a request as part of an assessment for a particular application. ECE approvals can be used with commercially sensitive items redacted as long as there is sufficient information to identify the model and approval number of the component.
Why are RFI's written in a nonsensical generic and cryptic form? RFI's should be direct, in plain sensible English and should actually ask a question. Directing the applicant to all guidance material without a specific "direction or a question" wastes time and adds no value.	7	Thanks for the feedback. Feedback like this assists us refine our processes and it has been passed to the assessment team for their information.

Previously the department has stated delays are being caused by poor quality applications. Has the department assessed the quality of the assessors and their assessments? Needless and Generic RFI's being raised with no real benefit.	6	The department continues to refine its processes based on real world application and feedback. Providing specific examples of RFIs you have concerns about through the Contact us webpage would assist us respond to concerns.
Confirmation as to the validity of the ADR circulars under the RVSA. If valid when these will be updated to reflect the change to the RVSA or will they be replaced by ADR guidance material? eg. how the unique certification requirements detailed in circular 84/-1-1 will be handled under the RVSA	5	There is no legislative basis for Advisory Circulars under the RVS legislation. Under the RVS legislation, it is the applicant's responsibility to demonstrate compliance with applicable ADRs, and how they choose to do this is not prescribed in the legislation. The department continues to make ADR-specific circulars available as guidance only - for example, to assist a manufacturer chose a worst case for testing. Applicants are not obliged to use circulars and if there is a conflict between information in a circular and the legislation, then the legislation will always take precedence.
Updating of Test Facility Address, when you enter the Test Facility in ROVER it states these details are from ROVER profile, after updating this the change is not reflected on Test Facility, how can a Test Facility Address be updated?	4	Testing facility applications will auto-populate with the applicant's saved information details when the application is commenced. If the applicant's details change during the application process, the applicant will need to commence a new application to reflect these changes. If the address details for testing facility locations change during the application process they can be edited. All address information can be changed as part of an application to vary an approval.
We have a memeber who has raised an issue regarding protection of IP when a UN ECE test report is used to demonstrate compliance of a component as part of a VTA submission.	4	ECE approvals can be used with commercially sensitive items redacted as long as there is sufficient information to identify the model and approval number of the component.
Why does the application QMS process include a requirement for QA assessment of component vendors. The VTA holder endorses that they are fitting components with CTAs approved for their models. The supply performance of the vendor is a commercial issue, not a safety or vehicle compliance issue.	3	Not all components are covered by a CTA. In a manufacturing process where components that affect ADR compliance are not covered by a CTA, the QMS must outline how the ongoing compliance of those components is assured. Where components are covered by CTAs the QMS should outline the processes that ensure those CTAs are in force and that fitting instructions are followed.

Question	Priority	Response
Can the "List of CTA" webpage filters be expanded to include a filter for "Applicable ADR's" Currently it is necessary to open each CTA individually to identify which ADR's it is approved for. Alternatively can there be a function to download a csv for all approved CTAs which include applicable ADRs	3	This item is on the backlog but has not yet been prioritised.
I'm having a consistent bug of attachments to RFIs not reaching the assessor despite me attaching them. This is delaying applications as it takes days for someone to look at the RFI. How can I report this bug? How can I directly talk to the assessors to circumvent this issue?	3	This bug has been fixed with Release 7. Please contact ROVERinfo@infrastructure.gov.au if this or similar issues persist.
Is there a plan to allow direct communication with assessors and submitters? The RFI system is too disconnected, and you get circular answers that would never occur in a direct conversation	3	Part of the reason for not identifying individual assessors is to free up assessors to do assessment work, rather than providing advice. It also avoids any (actual or perceived) conflict of interest. The RFI process allows 2-way communication or the ability to ask for a phone call if what is required cannot be explained in writing.
Acceptance of JC08 as a suitable alternative to ADR79: given this is in the legislation, and was given as an example of a suitable alternative in guidance material for the determinations, why are applicants for SEVS vehicles under Environmental criterion now being told JC08 is insufficient evidence?	2	JC08 was used as an example (in the Explanatory Statement to the determination, which is not a legislative instrument) of the sort of comparison that is required to show a vehicle complies with a comparable standard, not a statement that it is equivalent. The SEVs environmental criterion requires that a make and model meets or exceeds the emission standard that is equivalent to the ADRs. It would be difficult for a make and model manufactured before the ADR came into force to meet this requirement without testing.
Are we any closer of being able to upload a CSV file for product facility ID's instead of having to individually input?	2	This was considered as part of a larger 'clone applications' piece of work. Initial consultation did not show this capability to be a high priority. This capability remains on the backlog but has not yet been prioritised for a ROVER Release.
Will the ROVER 7 demo video be available in the Department's website. Would be good to be available for the industry to refer to.	2	A range of new ROVER 'how to' videos have been created and published that explain some of the new functionality deployed as part of Release 7.
Will there be a timeline/timetable issued on future updates ?	2	The department will provide as much advance notice as possible of future functionality and planned releases. Precise timing is difficult to predict too far in advance due to changing priorities (often in response to industry feedback), bug remediation, successful completion of testing, etc.

Question	#	Response
Will Rover 7 allow ADR's to be added to the application after first submission? Currently if an ADR is not included in the initial application we can't add a new ADR even if requested by an RFI.	2	Release 7 included the ability for applicants to withdraw an application that had been submitted. The application can then be amended (e.g.. to add additional ADRs) and resubmitted. RFIs will be closed automatically when an application is withdrawn, but they will still be visible against an application. When an application is resubmitted, it will restart the assessment process and will not necessarily return to the same assessor for continued assessment.
Can a not applicable option be added for transmissions? Some vehicles, eg electric drive/ hydrogen fuel cell vehicles do not have them.	1	Electric motors generally use a single speed automatic due to their unique torque characteristics. In these cases, please use a one speed automatic as the transmission option until a more specific option is developed.
Concerns regarding the ability of private citizens and companies with no qualifications being able to apply for and get approval for Test and Evaluation vehicles. Why are T&E applications not required to be done via an existing RAW? This seems like a massive loophole.	1	Information provided in T&E applications is carefully assessed. If an applicant is able to provide a test plan, including information about what needs to be tested, and the decision maker is satisfied the vehicle will only be used for testing and evaluation and meets all RVS requirements, the decision maker may grant approval. T&E approvals have set conditions applied to them, such as timeframes for use in accordance with test plans, restrictions on use after testing, and will not be entered on the RAV unless an appropriate approval is granted.
Is there going to be any further documentation released as a guide to producing QMS documents? RFIs generally refer to the guide page which includes very little information. Is there an effort to ensure the QMS responsibilities are being applied universally?	3	Appendices 2 and 3 of the *Guide to vehicle type approvals* (pages 54-57) include details regarding the type of information expected to be included in a QMS. The decision maker needs to be satisfied applicants are able to comply with legislative provisions relating to the ability to be able to consistently produce the type of vehicle and the ability to comply with the conditions of approval, including having an acceptable conformity of production system in place.
For Imports of approved vehicles into Australia under RVSA will a similar document to the MVSA Import Approval be issued. Previously the Import Approval Number was quoted on Customs Documents should Type Approval Numbers quoted on customs entries under RVSA	1	The department has actively been working to streamline this process, and an email was sent to VTA holders advising of the change. VTA holders who have an ABN may not need to answer Consumer Protection Questions (CPQs). For vehicles approved for importation individually, the concessional RAV entry approval number or the non-RAV entry approval number can be used on Customs documents.
When will ADR 97 be added to the ADR ROVER list so we can provide evidence?	1	ADR 97/00 is available to be added to applications in ROVER.

The Department has previously stated that a feature that enables the submission of multiple vehicles on a Single Road Vehicle application is currently scheduled for inclusion with ROVER Release 8.0. Is this still the case? and when is ROVER Release 8.0 scheduled for release?	1	This has been scheduled for a release expected to be deployed in the first quarter of 2023.
Regarding RAV outage planned for Release 7 (13/7 - 18/7), as RAV entries supplied during this period will be placed in a queue, and Date of Entry on the RAV will not be until the system is back online (18/7 9:00AM), what is the ruling around providing a vehicle that is not on the RAV?	1	Emails notifying of ROVER outage were sent, and emails to industry bodies notified that in order to be entered on the RAV all details must be completed. For vehicles to be provided during the ROVER update, they had to be entered on the RAV prior to 4pm Wednesday 13 July.
In past webinars, there was a discussion about improvement on search functions specific to CTA listing (able to search an ADR) and Approved Test Facility listing (location of facility, eg. state, and what ADR the facility is testing). What is the progress of these?	1	Both these features have been included on the product backlog, however, they have not yet been prioritised for a ROVER release.
A Grant of Concess. RAV Entry Approval email is sent when an approval is granted.This email has no info about the approved application. A 2nd email is sent containing a pdf of the approval.To reduce unnecessary comms can these emails be combined and include the Approved Vehicle details in the email?	1	This is a feature of the ROVER system as not all approvals commence at the time of decision. This feedback is noted, but at this point in time there are no plans to change this process.
The crane industry is waiting on feedback from the Department regarding ADR compliance requirements and exemptions for SPVs once the transition agreement ends. I've been informed that this is currently being worked on. What date can we expect a draft of this to be released?	0	This is actively being reviewed, and there has been ongoing consultation with other regulators to try to progress this.

With the change of government, will there be any review of the performance of the department in relation to RVSA introduction/ ROVER issues?	1	A review of the implementation of the RVSA will be conducted during a post implementation review.